

PATENT

C. REMARKS

1. Summary

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, and 14 are independent claims. Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended. Claims 3-4, 10-11, and 16-17 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

2. Examiner Telephonic Call

Applicants note with appreciation the telephone conversation conducted between Applicants' patent agent, Scott Schmok, and the Examiner on January 3, 2005. During the telephone conversation, the Examiner and Applicants' patent agent discussed the 103 reference (Kumar, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,697,810). The Examiner stated that by including the limitations of Applicants' dependent claims 3 and 4 into Applicants' independent claims, Applicants' independent claims would read over the art of record and, in fact, place Applicants' independent claims in condition for allowance. Applicants have included such amendments in this response.

3. Drawings

Applicants note that the Examiner did not indicate whether the formal drawings, filed with Applicants' application, are accepted by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate whether the formal drawings are accepted in the next office communication.

PATENT

4. Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 103, Alleged Obviousness

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,697,810 to Kumar et al. (hereinafter "Kumar") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,694,338 to Lindsay (hereinafter "Lindsay"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As discussed in the Examiner telephonic call section above, Applicants have included the limitations of original dependent claims 3 and 4 into independent claims 1, 8, and 14. The independent claims as amended are directed to "analyzing database security" and each include the limitations of:

- connecting to one or more servers, wherein each server includes an instance, the instance including one or more databases, wherein at least one of the databases is selected from the group consisting of a database, a backup database, and a directory of databases;
- selecting one of the databases;
- identifying a user id, wherein the user id has access to the selected databases;
- retrieving a permitted user id list corresponding to the selected database;
- determining whether the user id is included in the permitted user id list, the determining further comprising:
 - identifying a violation message type wherein the violation message type is selected from the group consisting of a removed users check, a DB files and logs access check, and a DB backup files and logs access check; and
- reporting the user id in response to the determining.

PATENT

With respect to the amended fifth limitation of Applicants' claim 1, Kumar does not teach, and the Examiner agrees, "identifying a violation message type wherein the violation message type is selected from the group consisting of a removed users check, a DB files and logs access check, and a DB backup files and logs access check" as claimed by Applicants. In fact, the Office Action reference to Kumar that was used to reject Applicants' limitation states:

"...is a process flow diagram illustrating a method of reporting the satisfaction of one or more trigger conditions in accordance with one embodiment of the invention. Although the agent may simply report the detection of various events, there may be further monitoring in association with these events."

(col. 19, lines 55-59).

As can be seen from the above cited section of Kumar, Kumar does not ever suggest identifying a violation message type that is selected from the group consisting of a removed users check, a DB files and logs access check, and a DB backup files and logs access check as claimed by Applicants. It is clear, therefore, that Kumar does not teach or suggest, in whole or in part, the fifth limitation of Applicants' amended claim 1. The Office Action does not contend that Lindsay teaches such limitation, and indeed it does not.

Therefore, since neither Kumar nor Lindsay teach or suggest, in whole or in part, either alone or in combination with one another, all of the limitations of Applicants' amended claim 1, claim 1 as amended is allowable, which the Examiner agrees. Claim 8 as amended is an information handling system claim including the same limitations of amended claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for the same reason as amended claim 1. Claim 14 as amended is a computer

PATENT

program product claim including the same limitations of amended claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for the same reason as amended claim 1.

Notwithstanding the fact that claim 2 is dependent upon claim 1 and therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 1, claim 2 adds the limitations to claim 1 of:

- retrieving a resolution corresponding to the determining; and
- including the resolution in the reporting.

Applicants claim "retrieving a resolution..and including the resolution in [a report]," such as "removing a user id for a directory access list" (page 12, lines 13-15). In contrast, Kumar does not teach the reporting of a resolution, but rather teaches "reporting the satisfaction of one or more trigger conditions" (col. 19, lines 55-56), emphasis added) where Kumar teaches that a trigger condition may be a "business event [that indicates] that an order has been received ..." (col. 10, lines 14-15, emphasis added), but does not teach including a resolution to the trigger condition in a report.

Since neither Kumar nor Lindsay teach or suggest, in whole or in part, "retrieving a resolution..and including the resolution in the reporting" as claimed by Applicants, claim 2 is in condition for allowance. Claim 9 is an information handling system claim including the same limitations of claim 2 and, therefore, is allowable for the same reason as claim 9. Claim 15 is a computer program product claim including the same limitations of claim 2 and, therefore, is allowable for the same reason as claim 2.

PATENT

Notwithstanding the fact that claim 6 is dependent upon claim 1 and therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 1, claim 6 adds the limitations to claim 1 of:

- wherein the permitted user id list is selected from the group consisting of a database instance owner, a sysadm group, and a sysmaint group.

In contrast to a permitted user id list, Kumar teaches the use of "security rules" (e.g. policies) to indicate a user's privileges, such as read access or read/write access. Specifically, the Office Action uses various areas of the Kumar reference to reject Applicants' claim 6. However, after further review, none of these references teach or suggest, in whole or in part, the limitation included in Applicants' claim 6. In fact, the references teach:

- a) reporting the satisfaction of one or more trigger conditions (col. 19, lines 55-59),
- b) firing a timer corresponding to a trigger condition (Figure 27), and
- c) providing access to a portion of data (Abstract).

Neither Kumar nor Lindsay teach or suggest, alone or in combination with one another, types of permitted user id lists as claimed by Applicants. Therefore, claim 6 is also allowable over Kumar in view of Lindsay.

Claim 12 is an information handling system claim including the same limitations of claim 6 and, therefore, is allowable for the same reason as claim 6. Claim 19 is a computer program product claim including the same limitations of claim 6 and, therefore, is allowable for the same reason as claim 6.

PATENT

Each of the remaining claims, 5, 7, 13, 18, and 20 each depend, directly or indirectly, on one of the allowable independent claims 1, 8, and 14. Therefore, claims 5, 7, 13, 18, and 20 are also allowable for at least the same reasons that the respective independent claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph T. Van Leeuwen
Joseph T. Van Leeuwen
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,383
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742